

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, and 22. As a result, claims 1-3, 5-9, 17-20, and 22-30 are pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner Wu for his time and courtesy in conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' undersigned representative Elaine Chi on August 16, 2010. During the interview, various aspects of the rejection of the claims as allegedly being unpatentable over the cited references were discussed. In particular, Examiner Wu and Elaine Chi discussed a proposed amendment which Examiner Wu agreed overcame the current rejection, but a further search would be necessary to determine allowability of the claims. Applicants contend that the amendments made to the claims reflect this discussion. Examiner Wu also agreed to an additional interview after reviewing this Amendment to discuss the case.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-9, 18, 20, and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0156787 (Jameson) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0200192 (Bell), in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0128934 (Shaer) and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0192883 (Cotten). Applicants submit that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer and Cotten teaches or suggests “analyzing the event using the feedback from the group of customers that attended the event and, based on the analyzing, generating a report to indicate an effectiveness of marketing the event and a quality of the event” as claimed therein. The Office admits that Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten fail to teach or suggest this feature of claim 1 but cites to paragraph [0101] of Cotten to allegedly cure this deficiency. See Office Action, page 5.

However, Applicants contend that neither this cited paragraph nor the remaining portions of Cotten teach or suggest the analyzing of claim 1. As discussed in the interview of August 16, 2010, in paragraph [0101], Cotten teaches an “event coordinator system 1102 [that] uses the received data to evaluate the work performance of event operators and to evaluate the success of events.” The received data in Cotten includes various “event information such as start time, end time, event ID, card ID, PIN number, purchase data, combinations of the foregoing, or the like. The purchase data includes purchase amount and, in certain embodiments, identification of items purchased by an event operator using an event card 702”. See Cotten, paragraph [0098]. To this extent, Cotten merely teaches that an event operator’s performance on providing a product demonstration is based on when the demonstration started or ended and the cost of the products purchased in order to conduct the product demonstration. Applicants assert that this received data in Cotten fails to teach or suggest “feedback from the group of customers that attended the event”, as provided in claim 1. Further, Applicants assert that neither Bell nor Shaer remedy this deficiency of Jameson.

As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1 and claims 2-3 and 5-9, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten.

With respect to claim 17, Applicants submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten teaches or suggests program code for integrating event management that includes all the features claimed therein. For example, for reasons that should be clear from the discussion of the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten above, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten fails to teach or suggest the program product of claim 17, including program code, which enables a computer system to analyze the event using the feedback from the group of customers that attended the event and, based on the analysis, generate a report to indicate an effectiveness of the marketing and a quality of the event including all the features claimed therein. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 17 and claims 18-20, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to claim 22, Applicants submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten teaches or suggests a computerized method for integrating event management that includes all the features claimed therein. For example, for reasons that should be clear from the discussion of the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten above, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten

fails to teach or suggest the method of claim 22, including analyzing the event using the feedback from the group of customers that attended the event and, based on the analysis, generate a report to indicate an effectiveness of the marketing and a quality of the event including all the features claimed therein. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 22 and claims 23-29, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Jameson, Bell, Shaer, and Cotten. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Furthermore, the Office rejects claims 19 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jameson in view of Bell, in view of Shaer, in view of Cotten, and further in view of the Office Notice. Applicants note that the Office relies on its rejection of independent claims 17 and 22, from which these claims depend. To this extent, Applicants incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to claims 17 and 22. Further, Applicants submit that the proposed addition of the Office Notice, even if, *arguendo*, proper, fails to address the deficiencies discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 17 and 22. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's

combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary and/or in a related patent application, either of which may seek to obtain protection for claims of a potentially broader scope.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all pending rejections of the claims. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elaine Chi/

Elaine Chi, Reg. No. 61,194
Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile

Dated: August 18, 2010